

# Thermochemical interpretation of 1-D seismic data for the lower mantle: The significance of non-adiabatic thermal gradients and compositional heterogeneity

*Laura Cobden*<sup>\*1</sup>, *Saskia Goes*<sup>1</sup>, *Matteo Ravenna*<sup>1</sup>, *Elinor Styles*<sup>1</sup>, *Fabio Cammarano*<sup>2</sup>, *Kerry Gallagher*<sup>3</sup>, *James A.D. Connolly*<sup>4</sup>

1. Department of Earth Science and Engineering, Imperial College London, London, SW7 2AZ, UK
2. Institute of Geophysics, ETH Zurich, Switzerland
3. Géosciences Rennes, Université de Rennes 1, Rennes, France
4. Institute of Mineralogy and Petrography, ETH Zurich, Switzerland

*\*Corresponding author, now at: Department of Earth Sciences, Utrecht University, 3584CD Utrecht, The Netherlands. E-mail address: [laura@geo.uu.nl](mailto:laura@geo.uu.nl).*

## Abstract

Equation-of-state (EoS) modelling, whereby the seismic properties of a specified thermo-chemical structure are constructed from mineral physics constraints, and compared with global seismic data, provides a potentially powerful tool for distinguishing between plausible mantle structures. However, previous such studies at lower mantle depths have been hampered by insufficient evaluation of mineral physics uncertainties, overestimation of seismic uncertainties, or biases in the type of seismic and/or mineral physics data used. This has led to a wide, often conflicting, variety of models being proposed for the average lower mantle structure. In this study, we perform a thorough re-assessment of mineral physics and seismic data uncertainties. Uncertainties in both the type of EoS, and mineral elastic parameters, used are taken into account. From this analysis, it is evident that the seismic variability due to these uncertainties is predominantly controlled by only a small subset of the mineral parameters. Furthermore, although adiabatic pyrolite cannot be ruled out completely, it is problematic to explain seismic velocities and gradients at all depth intervals with such a structure, especially in the interval 1660-2000 km. We therefore consider a range of alternative thermal and chemical structures, and map out the sensitivity of average seismic velocities and gradients to deviations in temperature and composition. Compositional sensitivity is tested both in terms of plausible endmember compositions (e.g. MORB, chondrite), and via changes in each of the five major mantle oxides, SiO<sub>2</sub>, MgO, FeO, CaO, and Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>. Fe-enrichment reduces both *P*- and *S*-velocities significantly, whilst Si-enrichment (and Mg-depletion) increases *P*- and *S*- velocities, with a larger increase in *P* than in *S*. Using purely thermal

deviations from adiabatic pyrolite, it remains difficult to explain simultaneously all seismic observations. A superadiabatic temperature gradient does improve the seismic fit in the lowermost mantle, but should be accompanied by concurrent bulk chemistry changes. Our results suggest that the most plausible way to alter bulk chemistry in the lowermost mantle, simultaneously fitting density, bulk velocity and shear velocity constraints, is an increasing contribution of a hot, basalt-enriched component with depth.

# 1. Introduction

The Adams-Williamson equation [*Williamson and Adams, 1923*] describes the relationship between density and depth for a homogeneous, adiabatic, self-compressing layer. In 1952 Birch [1952] used this equation to compare the elastic moduli of the mantle [as calculated from the velocity profiles of *Jeffreys and Bullen, 1940*] with those derived from experimental compression of a range of solids at lower mantle pressures. As the two sets of values were similar, Birch argued that the lower mantle must be “reasonably homogeneous” with at most only small deviations from adiabaticity. Furthermore, when normal mode measurements have been used to constrain the density profile of the mantle, only minor deviations from the Adams-Williamson equation are required [*Dziewonski and Anderson, 1981*]. Thus to first order it would seem that the lower mantle can be represented by a chemically homogenous, adiabatic material.

However, geochemistry presents compelling evidence for compositional heterogeneity at depth in the mantle. Most fundamentally, the 60 000-km-long global mid-ocean ridge network produces basalts which are remarkably uniform in chemical composition, yet the volcanism at oceanic islands generates basalts presenting a diverse range of compositions which can differ strongly from both each other, and the mid-ocean ridge basalts [*Hofmann, 1997*]. The classic interpretation of this phenomenon is that mid-ocean ridge basalts (MORBs) derive from a laterally homogeneous upper-mantle source region, whereas the ocean island basalts (OIBs) come from separate, chemically distinct reservoirs [although other interpretations

exist, e.g. *Anderson, 2007*]. The key issue is then where to put these chemically distinct regions within the mantle, and whether they can be detected seismically.

Trace element patterns and isotopic signatures, notably enrichment in incompatible and volatile elements relative to MORB, suggest OIB reservoirs are either chemically primitive [e.g. *Trieloff, et al., 2000*] – i.e. undisturbed by earlier melting events or convective mixing – and/or derive from recycled subducted crust [e.g. *Rapp, et al., 2008*]. Until the mid 1990s, it was often assumed, on the basis of cosmochemical and mass-balance constraints, that the entire mantle below 660-km was, convectively and chemically, largely isolated from the upper mantle [e.g. *Hart and Zindler, 1986*]. Under this scenario, OIBs were primitive melts transported from the lower mantle by thermal plumes. However, seismic tomography has repeatedly indicated that subducting slabs penetrate the lower mantle, with some slabs travelling as far down as the core-mantle boundary [*Grand, et al., 1997; van der Hilst, et al., 1997*]. This rules out the possibility of complete isolation between upper and lower mantle.

A number of “hybrid” solutions have been proposed to reconcile the seismic and geochemical observations, and an emerging popular scenario is to place a compositionally distinct region, or regions, somewhere in the bottom 1000 km of the mantle [*Albarede and van der Hilst, 2002; Kellogg, et al., 1999; van der Hilst and Karason, 1999*]. Numerical modelling indicates that both primitive and recycled mantle components can become concentrated deep within the lower mantle, as piles, undulating layers, or blobs [*Kellogg, et al., 1999; Nakagawa and Tackley, 2004*], via chemically-driven density variations. Such chemically-enriched regions provide a suitable source for OIBs, satisfying available geochemical constraints. Additionally,

this scenario is consistent with seismic observations, namely the existence of “superplumes” beneath Africa and the central Pacific. Superplumes, or LLSVPs (“large, low shear velocity provinces”), are long-wavelength tomographic anomalies below ~2000 km depth, characterised by low  $P$ - and  $S$ - velocities [Su and Dziewonski, 1997]. When their  $P$ - and  $S$ - velocities are expressed as bulk sound ( $K/\rho$ ) and shear ( $G/\rho$ ) velocities, a negative correlation is observed [Ishii and Tromp, 1999; Kennett, et al., 1998; Masters, et al., 2000; Resovsky and Trampert, 2003; Saltzer, et al., 2001; Su and Dziewonski, 1997], with high bulk velocities and low shear velocities. This anti-correlation is indicative of a chemical, as opposed to purely thermal, origin for the superplumes [e.g. Trampert, et al., 2004].

Equation-of-state (EoS) modelling, whereby the seismic properties of theoreticised mantle structures are computed from mineral physics data, has been invoked on many occasions as a tool for discriminating between the various thermo-chemical possibilities for the lower mantle [e.g. most recently Aizawa and Yoneda, 2006; Cammarano, et al., 2005b; da Silva, et al., 2000; Deschamps and Trampert, 2004; Jackson, 1998; Khan, et al., 2008; Li and Zhang, 2005; Matas, et al., 2007; Mattern, et al., 2005; Trampert, et al., 2001]. However, these studies have drawn widely varying interpretations as to whether a chemically homogeneous, near-adiabatic structure does or does not fit global seismic data, and what the nature of any alternative structure could be. Such inconsistencies arise through the authors’ choice of specific mineral elastic parameters; the method of extrapolating those parameters to lower mantle conditions; and the nature of the seismic data against which the thermo-chemical models are compared. In particular, as we will show, there has been a tendency to underestimate (or disregard) mineral physics uncertainties, and to

overestimate (or disregard) seismic data uncertainties. Because of the limited availability of relevant data, some studies have restricted calculations to the FeO-MgO-SiO<sub>2</sub> system, thereby excluding the effects of CaO and/or Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, whilst other studies have considered only bulk sound velocities, neglecting the potential importance of shear moduli effects.

In this study, EoS modelling of the lower mantle is revisited, to include a thorough assessment of both elastic parameter and EoS extrapolation uncertainties, referenced to a tightly-constrained seismic dataset. A range of thermal and chemical structures based on the CaO-FeO-MgO-Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-SiO<sub>2</sub> (CFMAS) system are tested against *P*- and *S*- velocities simultaneously. The purpose of this is two-fold: firstly, to map out the sensitivities of *P*- and *S*-velocities to thermal and chemical changes, and secondly to evaluate the extent to which the mineral physics data currently allow us to discriminate between different thermo-chemical models for the lower mantle.

## 2. Data and uncertainties

Our study considers the lower mantle from 800 km to 2500 km – i.e. from below the completion of garnet-to-perovskite phase transitions, and terminating above the seismically complex D'' layer. This depth range is also above the likely depth of the perovskite-to-post perovskite phase transition [e.g. *Ohta, et al.*, 2008]. Using several EoS's, we calculate average  $P$ - and  $S$ -wave velocities and velocity gradients in five depth intervals: 800-920 km, 920-1200 km, 1200-1660 km, 1660-2000 km and 2000-2500 km, and compare the values for our models with those obtained from inversion of real seismic data.

### 2.1 Seismic data

Lower mantle 1-D seismic structure is very tightly constrained by seismic data. It is therefore not necessary to test models directly against the raw data, i.e.  $P$  and  $S$  arrival times (as has been the case for the upper mantle where seismic uncertainties are larger, e.g. *Cammarano, et al.*, [2005a]; *Cobden, et al.*, [2008]). Instead we can facilitate comparisons by determining the fit of models to average velocities and velocity gradients, which are simpler to interpret than the corresponding travel times..

We use average velocities and gradients inferred from the 1-D seismic reference models PREM [*Dziewonski and Anderson*, 1981] and AK135 [*Kennett, et al.*, 1995] and run our own inversion of global ISC travel-time data [*Engdahl, et al.*, 1998; *Engdahl*, 2000, *pers. comm.*] to determine the uncertainties on the seismic data. In this inversion, the lower mantle is parameterised as a series of layers, within which



velocity gradients are constant, such that  $P$ - and  $S$ -velocities are specified only at the interfaces between layers. A starting velocity model is chosen, and a Reversible Jump Markov Chain Monte Carlo algorithm [after *Green*, 1995; see Appendix 1] is applied. This fully non-linear algorithm has the flexibility of allowing both the number of layers and the depths of layer interfaces to vary (i.e. the dimensions of the model can change during the inversion), as well as the velocities at the interfaces. At each iteration of the inversion, the fit of a given velocity model to direct  $S$ - and  $P$ - arrival times is assessed using the ray-tracing code TauP [*Crotwell, et al.*, 1999].

Initially, the inversion was run to allow for changes in all three of the parameter types: layer depths, number of layers, and interface velocities. The purpose of this was to try to establish where in the lower mantle any interfaces that separate regions of distinct velocity gradients may occur. However it was found that both the number and depths of such interfaces varied between different runs of the inversion – emphasising the smooth, continuous nature of the lower mantle velocity profile (Figure 1) – especially between 1200 and 1800 km. Nonetheless, most inversion runs suggested three main interfaces: one between 800-900 km, another between 1100-1200 km, and a third at ~1600-1800 km.

Following this, we re-ran the inversion code, but with the layer interfaces kept fixed at 760 km, 920 km, 1200 km, 1660 km and 2000 km, so that only the velocities at the interfaces were inverted for. These velocities then provided the average velocities and gradients used in this chapter to constrain mantle structure.

95% of the velocity models output from this procedure lie within an uncertainty bound of  $\pm 0.01$  km/s between 800 and 2000 km, whilst the velocity gradients have uncertainties of up to  $\pm 3 \times 10^{-5}$  s<sup>-1</sup>. This is similar to the uncertainty of  $\pm 0.02$  km/s assigned to the velocities in AK135 by *Kennett, et al.* [1995], and equates to a maximum percentage error of  $\pm 0.09\%$  on  $V_P$  and  $\pm 0.16\%$  on  $V_S$ . This is significantly less than the uncertainty of  $\sim 0.5\text{-}1\%$  typically allocated to lower mantle seismic structure, in those studies in which seismic uncertainties are taken into consideration [e.g. *Cammarano, et al.*, 2005b; *Deschamps and Trampert*, 2003; *Deschamps and Trampert*, 2004].

On subsequent figures, we show the velocities and velocity gradients output from two separate runs of the inversion, based on different starting models. We also show values computed for PREM and AK135 – the former being derived from a joint inversion of travel-times and normal modes, and the latter from inversion of travel-times only. The difference between values obtained from our inversion, and the reference models AK135 and PREM, gives an indication of the total error bars on the seismic structure.

Below 2000 km, our inversion does not have resolution to  $S$ -velocity structure. This is because the inversion uses direct arrivals only, and the direct  $S$  phase is complicated by overlap with the  $SKS$  arrival in the lowermost mantle. Therefore for the interval 2000-2500 km, average velocities and velocity gradients are shown for PREM and AK135 only – hence the uncertainty bounds are less clearly defined than at shallower depth intervals, although our inverted  $P$ -velocities for 2000-2500 km indicate uncertainties similar to those between 1660 and 2000 km.

## 2.2 Equation of state

There is no clear consensus on what is the most suitable equation of state for modelling the lower mantle. The most commonly-used pressure extrapolation is the third-order Birch-Murnaghan formulation, in which Helmholtz free energy is expressed as a Taylor series expansion of finite strain, truncated to third order [see, e.g., *Jackson, 1998* for a detailed review]. An investigation by Jackson [1998] has indicated that it does not matter whether the pressure extrapolation is done along an adiabat or along an isotherm. However, it has been suggested that expansion of the Birch-Murnaghan approach to fourth order may be more appropriate under lower mantle conditions [*Davies and Dziewonski, 1975*]. Meanwhile, two main approaches for high temperature extrapolation can be found in the geophysical literature. The first – associated with isentropic (adiabatic) pressure extrapolation – uses an Anderson-Gruneisen temperature correction. This is the method favoured by Trampert *et al.* [2001] and Deschamps and Trampert [2004], as well as being that adopted by Cammarano *et al.* [2005b]. It is endorsed [e.g. *Trampert, et al., 2001*] because it fits measured data for MgO [*Anderson, et al., 1995*] extremely closely. However, Deschamps and Trampert [2004] found that unless a cross-derivative term for the shear modulus, i.e. ,  $\partial^2 G / \partial P \partial T$  , is incorporated into the EoS then the extrapolation does not agree with values of the shear modulus of Mg-perovskite obtained from *ab-initio* simulations. Precise values for the cross-derivatives of  $K$  and  $G$  have not yet been determined. For this reason, some researchers, e.g. Matas *et al.* [2007], favour the second temperature extrapolation approach which, used in conjunction with an isothermal pressure extrapolation, involves a Mie-Gruneisen temperature correction

[outlined in *Matas, et al., 2007* and references therein]. With this method, cross-derivatives are accounted for internally and self-consistently.

We therefore consider three different equations of state: a third-order Birch-Murnaghan pressure extrapolation with non-linear Gruneisen temperature correction (Method *3E-Grun-4* of [*Cobden, et al., 2008*]); a fourth-order Birch-Murnaghan pressure extrapolation with Gruneisen temperature correction (method *4E-Grun*); and a modified third-order finite strain isothermal pressure extrapolation with Mie-Gruneisen temperature correction (method *3E-Mie* in [*Cobden, et al., 2008*]). For method *3E-Mie*, two variants are considered: *3E-Mie-1* is based on the EoS of [*Stixrude and Lithgow-Bertelloni, 2005a*] whilst *3E-Mie-2* uses a modified version of this EoS [*Stixrude and Lithgow-Bertelloni, 2005b*]. The aim of using these three EoSs is firstly to determine how significant the shortcomings of the *3E-Grun* thermal extrapolation are *seismically* relative to the *3E-Mie* approach, i.e. once they are translated into actual velocities, and secondly whether it is actually possible to fit adiabatic pyrolite to seismic data, once uncertainties in EoS are taken into account in addition to the mineral parameter uncertainties.

### **2.3 Elastic parameter uncertainties**

Even greater controversy exists for deciding which values of particular elastic parameters should be applied with a given EoS than for the choice of EoS itself. This is because either the parameters are unknown/poorly indicated by experimental data, or different experiments produce vastly different results [*Matas, et al., 2007*]. Such controversy has led to widely varying results as to whether an adiabatic temperature

gradient and/or pyrolitic composition do or do not fit seismological data for the lower mantle [*Aizawa and Yoneda*, 2006 ; *Jackson*, 1998; *Matas, et al.*, 2007; *Mattern, et al.*, 2005 -all use the same equation of state but between them cite evidence for: an adiabatic pyrolite mantle, a sub-adiabatic thermal structure, a super-adiabatic thermal structure, Si-enrichment with depth, Fe-enrichment with depth, and Mg-enrichment with depth]. In particular, it is clear that seismic velocities are highly sensitive to the pressure derivative of the shear modulus, but there is significant disagreement between experimentally-determined values [*Matas, et al.*, 2007 provides a good review of the topic].

The advantage of the approach presented here over previous studies of the lower mantle is that we consider uncertainties in both the EoS and the mineral elastic parameters. A careful consideration of elastic parameter uncertainties for the FeO-MgO-SiO<sub>2</sub> system, and in later studies also CaO, was previously performed by Trampert and co-workers [*Trampert, et al.*, 2001; *Deschamps and Trampert*, 2003; *Deschamps and Trampert*, 2004], and similarly elastic moduli uncertainties were assessed in detail for the CaO-FeO-MgO-Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-SiO<sub>2</sub> system by *Cammarano, et al.* [2005b]. However, these studies used a specific EoS which differs in its temperature extrapolation from that favoured by more recent studies [e.g. *Khan, et al.*, 2008; *Matas, et al.*, 2007], and in our study we consider both these variants of EoS. Uncertainties in *all* the elastic parameters are taken into account simultaneously, and mapped as an uncertainty contour in velocity space. Adiabatic pyrolite can only be conclusively discounted as a plausible average structure for the lower mantle if it falls outside this uncertainty contour.

For *3E-Grun* and *4E-Grun*, 5000 models were calculated for which the parameters  $K$ ,  $G$ ,  $\partial K/\partial T$ ,  $\partial G/\partial T$ ,  $\partial K/\partial P$ ,  $\partial G/\partial P$ ; and thermal expansion coefficient  $\alpha$  varied randomly within the uncertainty bounds defined by Cammarano *et al.* [2003], using a Monte-Carlo search of the solution space, for the minerals  $\text{MgSiO}_3$  perovskite and  $\text{MgO}$  periclase. Previous studies have indicated that 5000 models is a sufficiently large sample to define the solution space [Cammarano, *et al.*, 2005b; Cobden, *et al.*, 2008]. Random values were not assigned to the elastic parameters of Ca-perovskite because it is probable that its uncertainties are encapsulated by those defined with the other two minerals. For *4E-Grun*, the second order derivatives of  $K$  and  $G$  were varied by up to -200% from their starting values.

For *3E-Mie-1*, elastic parameter values are taken from the thermodynamic database of Stixrude & Lithgow-Bertelloni [2005a] supplemented by data for the lower mantle as described by [Khan, *et al.*, 2006]. Meanwhile, the *3E-Mie-2* calculations use the updated thermodynamic database published in [Stixrude and Lithgow-Bertelloni, 2007] implemented in the program *Perple\_X* [Connolly, 1990]. However, uncertainty bounds on individual parameters are given in Stixrude and Lithgow-Bertelloni [2007] for method *3E-Mie-2* only. For computational efficiency, we calculated velocity models for which each of the elastic parameters took their maximum and minimum values only. From these tests, we found that uncertainties from different parameters are broadly additive. For example, higher values of  $K$  and  $\partial K/\partial P$  will both increase  $V_p$ , and the increase observed with setting both  $K$  and  $\partial K/\partial P$  to their maximum values is greater than that observed from just setting one of them to its maximum. For  $S$ -velocities, the highest values are obtained by setting  $K$ ,  $\partial K/\partial P$ ,  $G$ ,  $\partial G/\partial P$  to their maximum values within the uncertainty bounds, and  $\eta$  to its minimum where  $\eta$  is a

parameter describing the temperature dependence of the shear modulus [see e.g. *Stixrude and Lithgow-Bertelloni, 2005b*].  $P$ -velocities are only significantly altered by two parameters:  $K$  and  $\partial K / \partial P$  (highest velocities occurring when these are set to their maximum values, and vice versa) and the magnitude of such variations are less than those for  $S$ -waves. Interestingly the effects of elastic parameters on velocity gradients are not correlated to the effects on velocities:  $P$ -velocity gradients are only altered significantly by changes in  $K$ , and this time the minimum value of  $K$  produces the highest gradient.  $S$ -velocity gradients are only significantly affected by  $\partial G / \partial P$ , with the highest gradients occurring at the maximum value of  $\partial G / \partial P$ . The seismic error bounds derived from this method are very similar in magnitude to those defined by the extensive Monte Carlo search. Therefore, in subsequent figures (e.g. Figure 2), the velocity space mapped out by elastic parameter uncertainties is illustrated as a single elliptical contour, this contour being the locus of the 95% confidence limit of the 5000 random models.

Certain features of the uncertainty ellipses require some discussion. Firstly, it appears that the velocity gradient uncertainties become smaller with increasing depth (see Figure 2), which is counterintuitive with the notion that uncertainties should increase the further they are extrapolated from room temperature and pressure. This happens for uncertainty bounds estimated with both the *3E-Grun* and *3E-Mie* datasets. However, the absolute values of the gradients also decrease, so that in fact the percentage uncertainty remains almost constant as the depth increases. The lack of an increase may be related to the small number of minerals present and the similarity of their bulk and shear moduli as  $P$  and  $T$  increase. Secondly, uncertainties in  $V_S$  are at

times a little larger than uncertainties in  $V_P$ . This is probably a consequence of the sensitivity of  $V_S$  to a greater range of elastic moduli than  $V_P$ .

## 2.4 Phase equilibria

Phase relations along a given  $P$ - $T$  locus are calculated using the *Perple\_X* program package [Connolly, 1990; Connolly 2005] via a free-energy minimization algorithm. For methods *3E-Grun*, *4E-Grun* and *3E-Mie-1* the input thermodynamic data for the minimization are from *Stixrude & Lithgow-Bertelloni* [2005a] supplemented in places as described by [Khan, *et al.*, 2006], and for *3E-Mie-2*, the input data are taken from [Stixrude and Lithgow-Bertelloni, 2007]. Bulk compositions are specified in terms of the end-members  $\text{SiO}_2$ ,  $\text{MgO}$ ,  $\text{FeO}$ ,  $\text{CaO}$  and  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ . Partitioning of Fe between the different minerals present is determined implicitly by the free energy minimization.

## 2.5 Effect of anelasticity

In the upper mantle, the contribution of (shear) anelasticity to seismic velocities is significant [Karato, 1993]. However, studies of the lower mantle indicate that the importance of anelasticity is considerably smaller below the transition zone [Brodholt, *et al.*, 2007; Cammarano, *et al.*, 2003; Matas and Bukowinski, 2007; Trampert, *et al.*, 2001]. Therefore, the anharmonic velocities we calculate are corrected for anelasticity, but the same anelasticity structure is assumed in all our models [model Q5 of Cammarano, *et al.*, 2003].



### 3. Fit of 1300°C adiabatic pyrolite to seismic data

We would like to test whether a compositionally homogeneous, thermally well-mixed lower mantle is compatible with seismic data. We begin by assuming a composition of pyrolite (i.e. MORB-source, as expected for whole-mantle convection) and an adiabatic temperature gradient (as results from vigorous convection). Preliminary investigations by Cammarano *et al.* [2005b] indicated that, for a pyrolitic composition, and an adiabat with potential temperature of 1300°C, a chemically homogeneous, adiabatic structure is *not* compatible with seismic data. In particular, calculated model velocities of Cammarano *et al.* [2005b] increase too rapidly with depth compared with 1-D seismic reference models. However, the computations of Cammarano *et al.* [2005b] do not consider uncertainties in the equation of state (EoS) used to compute lower mantle velocities. The precise choice of EoS used is more pertinent in the lower mantle than for the upper mantle, since mineral parameters are being extrapolated much further from their experimental values, leading to greater potential for errors.

Additionally, an adiabatic, homogeneous structure need not have to be pyrolitic in composition, or constrained to a potential temperature of 1300°C. Furthermore, within a vigorously-convecting chemically-homogeneous system, internal heating can lead to subadiabatic temperature gradients [Bunge, *et al.*, 2001]. In fact, given the evidence for thermochemical heterogeneity in the upper mantle [Cobden, *et al.*, 2008], it seems especially likely that the physical structure represented by 1-D seismic models will deviate from 1300°C adiabatic pyrolite.

In Figure 2 we show the fits of the different EoSs *3E-Grun* and *3E-Mie* to average velocities and velocity gradients of the lower mantle, for 1300°C adiabatic pyrolite. *3E-Grun*, the EoS used by Cammarano *et al.* [2005b], tends towards being too fast, and having too high velocity gradients, at all depth intervals, but with increasing depth it deviates further from the seismic data. In fact, it deviates so far from the seismic data that even extreme adjustments in temperature and composition (not plotted here) cannot bring its velocities and gradients to be in line with the data. We conclude that, irrespective of whether adiabatic pyrolite is an appropriate structure for the lower mantle, the *3E-Grun* EoS is not suitable for modelling lower mantle behaviour. Likewise, the fourth-order EoS, *4E-Grun*, is rejected as a useful EoS to model the lower mantle because it over-estimates the second derivative of the velocities, such that nearly all of the 5000 models develop negative velocity gradients above 2500 km. This is probably related to the fact that the second order pressure derivatives of the elastic moduli,  $\partial^2 K / \partial P^2$  and  $\partial^2 G / \partial P^2$ , which the 4<sup>th</sup> order EoS requires, are not available for most minerals.

*3E-Mie* has a much closer fit to the seismic data. Taking elastic parameter uncertainties into account, it could be argued that with *3E-Mie*, 1300°C adiabatic pyrolite is consistent with the average velocities at all depth intervals. For the average velocity gradients, the only depth interval where *3E-Mie* does not fit the seismic data is 1660-2000km, because the *P*-velocity gradients are too high. However *3E-Mie-1* and *3E-Mie-2* both use elastic parameter datasets which at times lie at one extreme of the published data range. We have therefore added to Figure 2 the adiabatic pyrolite calculated by Matas *et al.* [2007], which uses the same style of EoS as *3E-Mie* but a different mineral physics dataset. The mineral parameters from Matas *et al.* [2007] are

more average relative to a range of other studies that have noted systematic mismatches between predicted adiabatic pyrolite velocities and seismic models. This extra data point (“Matas07”, Figure 2) yields average velocities and gradients intermediate between those of *3E-Mie* and *3E-Grun* such that it fits the average velocities, but with increasing depth both its *P*- and *S*- gradients become increasingly too high.

We conclude that using a Mie-Gruneisen temperature correction (method *3E-Mie*) provides a much closer fit to lower mantle 1-D seismic data than a simple Gruneisen correction (method *3E-Grun* and the method of [Cammarano, *et al.*, 2005b]), for both *P*- and *S*- velocities. Adiabatic pyrolite may fit the seismic data, but there is still a tendency for velocities and velocity gradients to be over-estimated with increasing depth, and in particular it is difficult to fit *P*-velocity gradients between 1660 and 2000 km. This result is consistent with experimental measurements and first principles simulations of sound velocities in perovskite and magnesiowustite, which have noted that  $V_P$  and  $V_S$  of pyrolitic compositions are too high to match seismic data at these depths [Jackson, *et al.*, 2006; Wentzcovitch, *et al.*, 2004].

## 4. Alternative thermo-chemical structures

Unlike the upper mantle,  $P$ - and  $S$ -velocities of 1-D seismic reference models increase smoothly with depth in the lower mantle, with no major discontinuities (Figure 1). Phase diagram computations indicate that behaviour is dominated by just three minerals: orthorhombic Mg/Fe/Al-perovskite; cubic Ca-perovskite; and Fe/Mg-magnesiowustite, whose proportions do not vary with depth for a fixed chemical composition. Any volumetrically-significant deviations in temperature, composition or structure must therefore be relatively subtle and/or non-global in character in order that they bias the 1-D average seismic signal, without producing global discontinuities. The purpose of this section is to test the magnitude and direction in which alternative temperature structures and compositions can alter the 1-D average seismic signal, to see if any would provide an improved fit to the seismic data over adiabatic pyrolite.

### 4.1 Alternative thermal structures

Birch demonstrated that deviations from adiabaticity in the lower mantle are likely to be small [*Birch*, 1952]. Nonetheless, a range of mechanisms could allow either sub- or super-adiabatic gradients to develop which, although small, could influence the 1-D seismic average. Additionally, if thermal changes are concurrent with chemistry changes, then the latter may mask the seismic effect of the former. In fact, the temperature of the lower mantle is only loosely constrained at two points: the 660-

discontinuity, and the core-mantle boundary (Figure 3). This leaves a lot of leeway for deviations from adiabaticity.

Numerical simulations of convection in the Earth have repeatedly shown that internal heating due to radioactive decay within the mantle causes temperature to increase with depth more slowly than that predicted for an adiabat, i.e. sub-adiabaticity [*Bunge, et al., 2001*]. Sub-adiabatic gradients may also develop as rising hot flows (/sinking cold flows) are forced to turn from vertical to horizontal at the top and base of the mantle [*Sinha and Butler, 2007*]. This subadiabaticity can amount to several hundred degrees by the base of the mantle.

Alternatively, chemical changes in the lowermost mantle could impede convective flow. For example, stagnation of hot material could occur at depth if there is enrichment of iron, as this has a high intrinsic density compared with iron-poor compositions. (Under lower mantle conditions, chemical buoyancy can potentially dominate over thermal buoyancy, because thermal expansion is greatly reduced at high pressures [*Trampert, et al., 2004*]). Or, the discovery of a high-spin to low-spin transition in iron itself around 1700-2000 km depth [*Badro, et al., 2003*] provides a means of enhancing thermal conductivity, in turn reducing convective overflow [*Badro, et al., 2005*]. Either of these effects may contribute to a superadiabatic temperature gradient at depth. Additionally, a deep, dense layer enriched in heat-producing (radioactive) elements has been suggested as a means of reconciling global heat-flow predictions with observations [*Kellogg, et al., 1999*].

We therefore compute the seismic properties of (1) adiabats with a range of potential temperatures, and (2) non-adiabatic structures (Figure 3).

Sensitivity tests indicate that  $S$ -velocities are more sensitive to temperature changes than  $P$ -velocities, whilst bulk sound and density have very small sensitivities (Figure 4). Furthermore, there is a reasonable consensus on the thermal sensitivity between different studies, where the parameter and EoS range we investigate spans published values of temperature derivatives. As a result, with increasing adiabat potential temperature,  $\langle V_p \rangle$  and  $\langle V_s \rangle$  decrease along a linear trend which does not intersect the global seismic data (Figure 5) because the ratio  $V_p/V_s$  of the adiabats is too high.

Figure 5 also shows that with increasing potential temperature, average *velocity gradients* do not change significantly for an adiabatic structure. A non-adiabatic thermal structure is required to change the velocity gradients significantly. Subadiabats will increase gradients, and superadiabats will decrease gradients, along a linear trend (Figure 5). Therefore, a superadiabatic temperature gradient improves the fit of pyrolite to average velocity gradients below 1200 km (especially in the depth interval 1660-2000 km), but a subadiabatic gradient seems unlikely given that it reduces the fit to both average velocities and velocity gradients. This is consistent with the observation that the potential temperature of the best-fitting adiabat increases with depth (Figure 5). However, a superadiabatic gradient favours absolute temperatures immediately above ~1200-1660 km which are cooler than that of a  $T_{pot}=1300^\circ\text{C}$  adiabat (e.g.  $T_{pot} \sim 1200^\circ\text{C}$ ), otherwise average velocities tend to become too slow below 1660 km – unless accompanied by a change in chemical composition. Figures 3 and 5 indicate that between 1660 and 2000 km a temperature excess of 50-

300°C above adiabatic fits the data, which is consistent with the derivative uncertainty ranges shown in Figure 4. Note that the subadiabatic profile (Figures 3 and 5) is on average only 50°C below the adiabatic gradient in this depth interval and already does not fit the data.

## 4.2 Alternative bulk chemical composition

### 4.2.1. Sensitivity test

We next examine the sensitivity of seismic velocities and density to compositional deviations from pyrolite (Figure 6). For a better insight into which aspects of chemical composition modify these properties it is necessary to consider the actual oxides from which bulk compositions are comprised – i.e. MgO, SiO<sub>2</sub>, FeO, CaO and Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, rather than specific “endmember” bulk compositions which may be arbitrarily defined. For each of these oxides, we have assigned a ‘minimum’ and ‘maximum’ value based on the range of molar percentages they take within proposed bulk compositions in published literature [e.g. compilations in *Poirier, 2000; Williams and Knittle, 2005;* and references therein]. These are: 0 and 20 mol% for the minor components FeO, CaO and Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>; and 30 and 60 mol% for the major components SiO<sub>2</sub> and MgO. Such values are extreme – well beyond the ranges one could realistically expect for the bulk mantle – but mapping the seismic behaviour of extremes is essential for understanding compositional sensitivity. In each test, we keep the relative molar ratios of four of the oxides fixed (and equal to their ratios in pyrolite), whilst the percentage of the remaining oxide is taken to its maximum and minimum values. Although decreases in one or other of Mg and Si are unavoidably correlated with increases in the other, we choose to study them individually for a clearer understanding of their seismic relevance.



Figure 6 shows that different oxides produce markedly different seismic trends, both from each other and from the trends due to temperature changes. FeO content has a large effect on average velocities: the higher the FeO content, the *lower* both  $V_P$  and  $V_S$ . Contrastingly, the higher the SiO<sub>2</sub> content, the *higher* are both  $V_P$  and  $V_S$ . SiO<sub>2</sub> content has a larger effect on  $V_S$  than  $V_P$ . Meanwhile, increasing the MgO content *lowers*  $V_P$  but has a very minor effect on  $V_S$ .

The effects of Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> and CaO are uncertain. Figure 6 implies that Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> has a negligible effect on both  $V_P$  and  $V_S$ . However, the phase behaviour of aluminium in the lower mantle is unclear. In our calculations, all Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> is incorporated into perovskite but in reality some may partition into another Al-rich phase [Perrillat, *et al.*, 2006], with different seismic properties. Nonetheless given the small volumetric significance of aluminium, the effect of an alternative phase is not expected to be major. For CaO, method 3E-Mie-2 predicts *higher* values of  $V_S$  without much change in  $V_P$  but method 3E-Mie-1 suggests little seismic sensitivity to CaO changes. Previously, Deschamps and Trampert [2003; 2004] also found a low sensitivity of seismic velocities to calcium content, approximately an order of magnitude smaller than the sensitivity to iron content. Tighter constraints on the elastic properties of CaO would help to constrain this further.

We have not included velocity gradients in Figure 6: the effect of different compositions on velocity gradients is small relative to elastic parameter uncertainties and does not improve the fit to seismic data. Composition would need to change gradually with depth from a faster to a slower material in order to reduce the velocity gradients as required between 1660 and 2000 km.

Note that Fe-rich compositions lead to low bulk and shear velocities but high densities, whereas Si-rich/Mg-poor compositions lead to high bulk velocities and high densities without much change in shear velocity, at temperatures close to the 1300°C adiabat.

#### ***4.2.2 Possible alternative compositions***

We now show the seismic behaviour of four bulk compositions in which we might expect the lower mantle to be enriched (Figure 7). Two of these are MORB and harzburgite, since both these compositions would appear to be seismically significant around and above the transition zone [Cobden, *et al.*, 2008], and accumulated subducted material has been proposed as a source for lower mantle chemical heterogeneity [Coltice and Ricard, 1999]. The other two are possibilities associated with primitive material in the lower mantle.

It is commonly assumed that the Earth's bulk chemical composition is given by that of the solar nebula – minus volatiles [Poirier, 2000]. One can therefore surmise that a close approximation to Earth's bulk composition is represented by chondritic meteorites – the oldest type of meteorite, unmodified by igneous processes, with non-volatile elemental abundances similar to the solar photosphere [e.g. Palme and O'Neill, 2003]. There are several different classes of chondrite, and elemental abundances can vary by as much as 5-10% between different compilations even within the same sub-group [Lyubetskaya and Korenaga, 2007a]. However, in spite of these variations, and in spite of the fact that several different classes have been proposed as a representation of the Earth [e.g. Javoy, 1995], the majority of

chondrites (ordinary, enstatite, carbonaceous) are enriched in silicon relative to pyrolite [Williams and Knittle, 2005]. For a chondritic bulk Earth, the “missing” silicon could be segregated somewhere within the lower mantle [Williams and Knittle, 2005]. If so, then seismically we might expect to detect a lower mantle composition that is closer to chondritic than pyrolitic. We therefore test the C1-chondrite composition of Hart and Zindler [1986] since C1-chondrites have historically been the most widely-cited primitive Earth composition. Of course, it is entirely plausible that bulk primitive Earth composition is something other than chondritic [Drake and Righter, 2002]. Anderson [1989] argues that chondrite element abundances may be less similar to solar abundances than is often perceived, and on the basis of photospheric composition analyses, suggests an iron-rich “solar” composition as a possible alternative for bulk primitive Earth. As this composition is quite distinct from the others we test (Table 1) it has been included in this study.

Figure 7 shows that no single composition can improve the fit to the seismic data. At all depth intervals, MORB has the highest average  $P$ - and  $S$ -velocities – a consequence of its having a low MgO and high SiO<sub>2</sub> content (Table 1). The seismic properties of harzburgite and chondrite likewise are predominantly controlled by their Mg/Si ratio, with chondrite lying intermediate between pyrolite and MORB, and harzburgite very similar to pyrolite. However, the seismic behaviour of the solar composition is dominated by its high iron content – even though it has a relatively low MgO content which would tend to increase  $P$ -velocities, it attains the lowest  $P$ -velocities overall due to the stronger effect of iron. This is interesting because it implies that it is important to consider both variations in Mg/Si ratio *and* variations in Fe-content when attempting either to model or interpret data for the lower mantle.

Tests with alternative MORB compositions which attempt to correct for the absence of Na from our calculations indicate that MORB is always characterised by elevated  $V_p$ , but its  $V_s$  may increase or decrease relative to pyrolite, for a  $T_p = 1300^\circ\text{C}$  adiabat. At high temperatures, all MORB compositions tested show a reduction in  $V_s$ .

## 5. Discussion

### Adiabatic pyrolite or something else?

Our results indicate that adiabatic pyrolite is unlikely to be the most suitable average thermo-chemical model for the lower mantle, but cannot be ruled out completely at this stage, given the current uncertainties in the elastic parameters. In particular, it is difficult to fit velocity gradients, and to a lesser extent velocities, below 1660 km, using an adiabatic temperature gradient. Our sensitivity tests suggest several possible ways of obtaining a better fit to the seismic data than adiabatic pyrolite:

#### *1. Purely thermally*

It is possible to devise a thermal structure which will completely fit the 1-D seismic data used in this study. Such a structure would require a superadiabatic gradient incipient at some point below 1200 km, and especially marked between 1660-2000 km ( $\sim 0.4$  to  $0.8$  °C per km), together with an initial surface potential temperature at 800 km of  $\sim 1200$ °C (Figure 5). However, other studies indicate that while a superadiabatic gradient is likely at these depths [*da Silva, et al.*, 2000; *Khan, et al.*, 2008; *Verhoeven, et al.* 2009], it is difficult to invoke superadiabaticity as a mechanism to fit all other lower mantle observations. Firstly, the density of warm (superadiabatic) pyrolite is too low relative to PREM in the lowermost mantle [*Aizawa and Yoneda*, 2006; *Lee, et al.*, 2004] – a concurrent chemical change would be needed to increase density. Secondly, as discussed in section 1, geochemistry requires there to be some chemical heterogeneity at depth. It is been suggested that such heterogeneity may only be present on very small scales such that the majority of

the mantle has a uniform (MORB-source) composition [Lyubetskaya and Korenaga, 2007b]. However this leads to difficulty in explaining the seismic characteristics of the Pacific and African superplumes, which are now widely accepted as chemically distinct domains (e.g. Trampert *et al.*, 2004; Ishii and Tromp, 2004). If such large regions are indeed chemically distinct from the surrounding mantle, one would expect the 1-D average seismic structure to be influenced by them, as is the case for the upper mantle (e.g. [Cobden, *et al.*, 2008]) – unless either the seismic sum of the “superplume” domains and non-superplume domains coincidentally averages out to that of pyrolite, or the mineral physics uncertainties are larger than the shifts in 1-D average velocity which occur due to compositional variations.

It is worth considering also the effect of iron spin transitions. Experiments indicate a transition from high to low spin state in iron in ferropericlase somewhere between 40-90 GPa (~1100-2100 km) depending on iron content [Speziale, *et al.*, 2007] and that low-spin ferropericlase is associated with higher densities and velocities than its high-spin counterpart [Lin, *et al.*, 2006]. Badro *et al.* [2005] suggest that thermal conductivity may be enhanced in low-spin FeO. This could result in superadiabaticity in the lowermost mantle, at higher densities than are predicted for high-spin FeO. However, the most recent experiments on the spin transition [Crowhurst, *et al.*, 2008] indicate that during the broad depth interval over which the transition take place (~40-60 GPa), there is a transient softening of the elastic moduli, with a reduction in *P*- and *S*- velocities. As ferropericlase is globally ubiquitous in the lower mantle, a signal of this softening ought to be detectable in 1-D radial seismic profiles. However, the 1-D seismic velocities increase smoothly and continuously with depth (Figure 1), so the

actual existence of such a transition in the lower mantle, or how it can be reconciled with the seismic data, remains uncertain.

## 2. Chemically ( $\pm$ thermal component)

There are two dominant controls on seismic velocities: FeO, which causes reduced  $P$ - and  $S$ - velocities with increasing iron content, and Mg/Si ratio, which leads to higher  $P$ - and  $S$ - velocities as the ratio decreases, although with a stronger effect in  $P$ - (Figure 6). From a first glance at the velocity profiles in Figure 8, the most striking observation is that an iron-rich composition (represented here by Anderson's (1989) solar composition) would appear to provide a better fit to both  $P$ - and  $S$ - velocities below  $\sim 2250$  km depth than any of the other compositions, and indeed this may be the case for the Earth's lower mantle (potentially through having a composition with a solar component). However, pyrolite starts to deviate from the seismic references several hundred km above this depth (Figure 2), so thermo-chemical changes are also required above this depth. If the high velocity gradients of pyrolite between 1660-2000 km are to be reduced purely compositionally, then this requires a gradual shift to a seismically slower composition with increasing depth. Either Fe-enrichment or increasing the Mg/Si ratio could be invoked.

The problem with Fe-enrichment is that if it starts to happen as shallow as 1660 km, then average velocities become too slow (Figure 6) – unless the lower mantle is relatively cold. Additionally, the high density of iron may cause Fe-enriched material to stagnate, thereby reducing convective overturn, which would in turn increase

temperature gradients (i.e. superadiabaticity). Such superadiabaticity would cause the velocities to be even slower.

Several other studies have concluded that an increase in Mg-content is needed to fit various seismic and gravity constraints [*Aizawa and Yoneda, 2006; Khan, et al., 2008; Lee, et al., 2004*], i.e. an increase in Mg/Si ratio. However, the problem with increasing the Mg/Si ratio is that it may not produce sufficiently strong reductions in *S*-velocities, which would seem to be required to fit the 1-D average gradients, once mineral physics uncertainties are taken into account (Figure 2). Furthermore, it is difficult to provide a physical explanation for the high Mg/Si ratio, as both MORBs and chondrites – compositions in which one might expect the lower mantle to be enriched – are characterised by low Mg/Si ratios (Table 1).

Another candidate to consider is Si-enrichment/Mg-depletion (as associated with enrichment in MORB or a chondritic composition). For a 1300°C adiabat, high Si/Mg compositions such as MORB and chondrite increase *P*-velocities relative to pyrolite, such as to pull a pyrolite-based composition further away from the seismic data. This is the case even taking elastic parameter uncertainties into account. At higher temperatures, as would occur with a superadiabatic gradient, *P*-velocities are reduced along the thermal trend indicated in Figure 7. With our MORB composition (Table 1), then at present the equation of state we used, together with the elastic parameter uncertainties, still preclude hot MORB from fitting the average *P*-velocities, because they are still too high. However a composition with a slightly less elevated Si/Mg ratio could potentially fit the *P*-velocities.



Therefore, we suggest that superadiabatic basalt may be a volumetrically significant component in the lowermost mantle because it has a number of physical properties consistent with LLSVPs, namely, a high density and high bulk sound velocities, with low shear velocities (Figure 7). Analyses of global geodynamic data [*Forte and Mitrovica, 2001*] and numerical modelling of mantle convection [*Tan and Gurnis, 2007*] have yielded similar conclusions. The fact that superadiabatic basalt does not reconcile all seismic constraints simultaneously, and that no other thermochemical structure does either, is indicative that further work is required in refining the equation of state, and associated mineral elastic parameters, for the lower mantle, together with tighter constraints on the phase relations in MORB-like compositions. Equally, it shows that we need to consider how 3-D thermochemical variations can detectably map into the one-dimensional seismic average. Such biases in reference structure would affect interpretation of seismic anomalies of the deep mantle.

## Appendix 1: The Reversible Jump Markov Chain Monte Carlo (RJMCMC) algorithm

### (i) Procedure

We use a recently-developed statistical method of sampling, the RJMCMC algorithm, to invert P and S teleseismic travel times for the 1-D velocity structure of the lower mantle. The RJMCMC method was established by P. J. Green [Green, 1995; Green, 2001; Green, 2003] and recent reviews have been given by Sambridge, *et al.* [2006] and Gallagher, *et al.* [2009]. The most important feature of RJMCMC is that it allows jumps between models of different dimensions during inversion. That is, the number of model parameters varies during the inversion and is itself treated as an unknown parameter to be solved for. This method is extremely suited to solving the travel time inversion problem, because it avoids the need for an a priori segmentation of the Earth into a fixed number of layers, and allows us to investigate the required smoothness of the velocity profile.

The RJMCMC algorithm is designed to generate a Markov Chain, i.e. a sequence of models (converging to the solution space) in which the values of the parameters of the updated model depend only on the values of the parameters of the previous model. At each stage in the chain, an "acceptance probability"  $\alpha$  for the proposed model is calculated. If  $\bar{x}$  and  $\bar{x}'$  are the model parameter vectors of the current and proposed model then, according to Green [1995],  $\alpha$  is given by:

$$\alpha(\bar{x}, \bar{x}') = \frac{\pi(\bar{x}')q(\bar{x}, \bar{x}')}{\pi(\bar{x})q(\bar{x}', \bar{x})} JR|J| \quad (1)$$

where  $\pi(\bar{x})$  is the target distribution in the model space, which approximates to the solution space;  $q(\bar{x}, \bar{x}')$  is the proposal probability density function, which is used to

perturb the model parameters;  $JR$  is the jump ratio, or the ratio of the probability of proposing the proposed move to the probability of proposing the reverse move, and  $|J|$  is the Jacobian of the transformation.

If Bayesian inference is used, as in our case, then  $\pi(\vec{x})$  is seen as a posterior probability distribution of the model parameters  $\vec{x}$ , conditional on the observed data  $d_{obs}$ , and according to Bayes' Theorem,

$$\pi(\vec{x}) \propto L(d_{obs} | \vec{x})p(\vec{x}) \quad (2)$$

where  $L(d_{obs} | \vec{x})$  is a likelihood function calculated from the observed seismic data for the model  $\vec{x}$ , and  $p(\vec{x})$  is the prior probability distribution of the model parameters (based on prior knowledge). Substituting (2) into (1), we obtain:

$$\alpha(\vec{x}, \vec{x}') = \frac{L(d_{obs} | \vec{x}')p(\vec{x}')q(\vec{x}, \vec{x}')}{L(d_{obs} | \vec{x})p(\vec{x})q(\vec{x}', \vec{x})} JR|J| \quad (3)$$

The proposed model is accepted if a random number between 0 and 1, drawn from a uniform distribution, is less than  $\alpha(\vec{x}, \vec{x}')$ . If accepted, the proposed model  $\vec{x}'$  becomes  $\vec{x}$  during the next step of the chain.

### (ii) Data input

Travel time data are taken from the ISC catalogue reprocessed by Engdahl *et al.* [Engdahl, *et al.*, 1998; Engdahl 2000, *pers. comm.*]. We consider direct  $P$  and  $S$  arrivals only, in the epicentral distance ranges 24.75-89.75° and 23.25-79.75° respectively. We compute mean travel times as a function of epicentral distance at 0.5° intervals and assume an uncertainty on these times equal to 3 times the standard

deviation of the mean. We find that the uncertainty is approximately constant with epicentral distance for both  $P$  and  $S$  waves, at  $\pm 0.15$  s for  $P$  and  $\pm 1$  s for  $S$ .

The likelihood function  $L(d_{obs} | \vec{x})$  required to quantify the misfit between simulated and observed data (Equation 3), is given by:

$$L(\vec{tt}_{obs} | \vec{x}) = \frac{1}{[(2\pi)^N \det(E)]^{1/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} (\vec{tt}_{obs} - \vec{tt}_{pred}(\vec{x}))^T E^{-1} (\vec{tt}_{obs} - \vec{tt}_{pred}(\vec{x}))\right) \quad (4)$$

where we have assumed that the measurement errors for travel times have a normal distribution with zero mean and are uncorrelated;  $(\vec{tt}_{obs} - \vec{tt}_{pred}(\vec{x}))$  is the difference between the observed travel times and those predicted by the model parameters  $\vec{x}$ ;  $E$  is the covariance matrix of the measurement error vector, and  $N$  is the number of measurements (i.e. number of epicentral distances at which mean travel times are calculated). With the assumption of uncorrelated measurement errors,  $E$  is diagonal, and the exponential component of Equation 4 can be written as:

$$-0.5 * \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{\vec{tt}_{obs_i} - \vec{tt}_{pred_i}(\vec{x})}{\sigma_i} \right)^2$$

where  $\sigma_i$  is the uncertainty on the  $i^{\text{th}}$  mean travel time, taken to be constant over the whole epicentral distance range (see above). This expression is also referred to as the log likelihood (minus a constant term).

The synthetic model  $\vec{x}$  has three components: a number of layers, depths of the layer interfaces, and velocities at each interface. We set the prior function  $p(\vec{x})$  for each of these parameters to a uniform distribution, i.e. every value within a defined range is as likely as any other. For example, with the velocities, the prior distribution is centered around the AK135 mean value, with a range of  $\pm 1$  km/s. For number of layers, the distribution ranges uniformly from 2 to 50 layers. Interface depths span the depth

range of the lower mantle (660 to 2891 km). Details of the proposal distributions,  $q(\bar{x}, \bar{x}')$ , are beyond the scope of this paper and for further information the reader is referred to Ravenna [2009].

## **Acknowledgments**

We are grateful to Ian Jackson and an anonymous reviewer whose comments helped to improve the manuscript. We thank Lars Stixrude for assistance with implementing their data bases into Perple\_X, and Paul Tackley for providing output from his dynamic thermo-chemical models for comparison with our interpretations.

## References

- Aizawa, Y., and A. Yoneda (2006), P-V-T equation of state of MgSiO<sub>3</sub> perovskite and MgO periclase: Implication for lower mantle composition, *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 155, 87-95.
- Akaogi, M., et al. (1989), Olivine-Modified Spinel-Spinel Transitions in the System Mg<sub>2</sub>SiO<sub>4</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>SiO<sub>4</sub> - Calorimetric Measurements, Thermochemical Calculation, and Geophysical Application, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth and Planets*, 94, 15671-15685.
- Albarede, F., and R. D. van der Hilst (2002), Zoned mantle convection, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series a-Mathematical Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 360, 2569-2592.
- Anderson, D. L. (1989), Composition of the Earth, *Science*, 243, 367-370.
- Anderson, D. L. (2007), *New theory of the Earth*, 1st ed., 384 pp., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Anderson, O. L., et al. (1995), A New Thermodynamic Approach for High-Pressure Physics, *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 91, 3-16.
- Badro, J., et al. (2005), Thermochemical state of the lower mantle: new insights from mineral physics, in *Earth's Deep Mantle: Structure, Composition and Evolution*, edited by R. Van der Hilst, et al., pp. 241-260, American Geophysical Union, Washington D.C.
- Badro, J., et al. (2003), Iron partitioning in Earth's mantle: Toward a deep lower mantle discontinuity, *Science*, 300, 789-791.
- Birch, F. (1952), Elasticity and constitution of the Earth's interior, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 57, 227-286.
- Brodholt, J. P., et al. (2007), Chemical versus thermal heterogeneity in the lower mantle: The most likely role of anelasticity, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 262, 429-437.
- Bunge, H. P., et al. (2001), Non-adiabaticity in mantle convection, *Geophysical research letters*, 28, 879-882.
- Cammarano, F., et al. (2005a), One dimensional physical reference models for the upper mantle and transition zone: combining seismic and mineral physics constraints, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 110, doi:10.1029/2004JB003272.
- Cammarano, F., et al. (2005b), Is a pyrolitic mantle compatible with seismic data?, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 232, 227-243.
- Cammarano, F., et al. (2003), Inferring upper-mantle temperatures from seismic velocities, *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 138, 197-222.
- Cobden, L., et al. (2008), Thermochemical interpretation of one-dimensional seismic reference models for the upper mantle: evidence for bias due to heterogeneity, *Geophysical Journal International*, 175, 627-648.
- Coltice, N., and Y. Ricard (1999), Geochemical observations and one layer mantle convection, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 174, 125-137.
- Connolly, J.A.D. (1990), Multivariable phase diagrams - an algorithm based on generalized thermodynamics, *American Journal of Science*, 290, 666-718.
- Connolly, J.A.D. (2005), Computation of phase equilibria by linear programming: A tool for geodynamic modeling and its application to subduction zone decarbonation, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 236, 524-541.
- Crotwell, H. P., et al. (1999), The TauP Toolkit: Flexible travel time and ray path

- utilities, *Seismological Research Letters*, 70, 154-160.
- Crowhurst, J. C., et al. (2008), Elasticity of (Mg,Fe)O through the spin transition of iron in the lower mantle, *Science*, 319, 451-453.
- da Silva, C. R. S., et al. (2000), The composition and geotherm of the lower mantle: constraints from the elasticity of silicate perovskite, *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 118, 103-109.
- Davies, G. F., and A. M. Dziewonski (1975), Homogeneity and Constitution of Earths Lower Mantle and Outer Core, *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 10, 336-343.
- Deschamps, F., and J. Trampert (2003), Mantle tomography and its relation to temperature and composition, *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 140, 277-291.
- Deschamps, F., and J. Trampert (2004), Towards a lower mantle reference temperature and composition, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 222, 161-175.
- Drake, M. J., and K. Righter (2002), Determining the composition of the Earth, *Nature*, 416, 39-44.
- Drake, M. and K. Righter (2002), Determining the composition of the Earth, *Nature*, 416, 39-42.
- Dziewonski, A. M., and D. L. Anderson (1981), Preliminary Reference Earth Model, *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 25, 297-356.
- Engdahl, E.R., R. Van der Hilst and R. Buland (1998), Global teleseismic earthquake relocation with improved travel times and procedures for depth determination, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, 88, 722-743.
- Forte, A. M., and J. X. Mitrovica (2001), Deep-mantle high-viscosity flow and thermochemical structure inferred from seismic and geodynamic data, *Nature*, 410, 1049-1056.
- Gallagher, K., et al. (2009), Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling methods to determine optimal models, model resolution and model choice for Earth Science problems, *Marine and Petroleum Geology*, 26, 525-535.
- Goes, S., et al. (2004), Synthetic seismic signature of thermal mantle plumes, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 218, 403-419.
- Grand, S. P., et al. (1997), High resolution global tomography: A snapshot of convection in the Earth, *GSA Today*, 7, 1-7.
- Green, P.J. (1995), Reversible jump Markov chain Monte Carlo computation and Bayesian model determination, *Biometrika* 82, 711-732.
- Green, P.J. (2001), A Primer on Markov chain Monte Carlo, in *Highly Structured Stochastic Systems*, edited by O.L. Barndorff-Nielsen et al., pp 179-196.
- Green, P. J. (2003), Trans-dimensional MCMC, in *Highly Structured Stochastic Systems*, *Oxford Statistical Science Series*, edited by O. L. Barndorff-Nielsen, et al., pp. 179-196.
- Hart, S. R., and A. Zindler (1986), In Search of a Bulk-Earth Composition, *Chemical Geology*, 57, 247-267.
- Hofmann, A. W. (1997), Mantle geochemistry: The message from oceanic volcanism, *Nature*, 385, 219-229.
- Irfune, T., and A. E. Ringwood (1987), Phase-Transformations in a Harzburgite Composition to 26 Gpa - Implications for Dynamical Behavior of the Subducting Slab, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 86, 365-376.
- Ishii, M., and J. Tromp (1999), Normal-mode and free-air gravity constraints on lateral variations in velocity and density of Earth's mantle, *Science*, 285, 1231-1236.



- Jackson, I. (1998), Elasticity, composition and temperature of the Earth's lower mantle: a reappraisal, *Geophysical Journal International*, 134, 291-311.
- Jackson, J. M., et al. (2006), Single-crystal elasticity and sound velocities of (Mg<sub>0.94</sub>Fe<sub>0.06</sub>)O ferropericlasite to 20 GPa, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth*, 111.
- Javoy, M. (1995), The integral enstatite chondrite model of the Earth, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 22, 2219-2222.
- Jeffreys, H., and K. E. Bullen (1940), Seismological Tables, in *British Association Seismological Committee*, edited, London.
- Karato, S. (1993), Importance of Anelasticity in the Interpretation of Seismic Tomography, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 20, 1623-1626.
- Katsura, T., et al. (2004), Olivine-wadsleyite transition in the system (Mg,Fe)(<sub>2</sub>)SiO<sub>4</sub>, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth*, 109.
- Kellogg, L. H., et al. (1999), Compositional stratification in the deep mantle, *Science*, 283, 1881-1884.
- Kennett, B. L. N., et al. (1995), Constraints on seismic velocities in the Earth from traveltimes, *Geophysical Journal International*, 122, 108-124.
- Kennett, B. L. N., et al. (1998), Joint seismic tomography for bulk sound and shear wave speed in the Earth's mantle, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth*, 103, 12469-12493.
- Khan, A., et al. 2006, Constraining the composition and thermal state of the mantle beneath Europe from inversion of long period electromagnetic sounding data, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth*, 111.
- Khan, A., et al. (2008), On the Earth's mantle composition and thermal state from an inversion of seismic and gravity data, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *In press*.
- Lee, K. K. M., et al. (2004), Equations of state of the high-pressure phases of a natural peridotite and implications for the Earth's lower mantle, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 223, 381-393.
- Li, B. S., and J. Z. Zhang (2005), Pressure and temperature dependence of elastic wave velocity of MgSiO<sub>3</sub> perovskite and the composition of the lower, *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 151, 143-154.
- Lin, J. F., et al. (2006), Sound velocities of ferropericlasite in the Earth's lower mantle, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 33.
- Lyubetskaya, T., and J. Korenaga (2007a), Chemical composition of Earth's primitive mantle and its variance: 1. Method and results, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth*, 112.
- Lyubetskaya, T., and J. Korenaga (2007b), Chemical composition of Earth's primitive mantle and its variance: 2. Implications for global geodynamics, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth*, 112.
- Masters, G., et al. (2000), The relative behaviour of shear velocity, bulk sound speed, and compressional velocity in the mantle: Implications for chemical and thermal structure, in *Earth's Deep Interior: Mineral physics and tomography from the atomic to the global scale* edited by S. I. Karato, et al., pp. 63-87, American Geophysical Union, Washington, D.C.
- Matas, J., et al. (2007), On the bulk composition of the lower mantle: predictions and limitations from generalized inversion of radial seismic profiles, *Geophysical Journal International*, 170, 764-780.
- Matas, J., and M. S. T. Bukowski (2007), On the anelastic contribution to the

- temperature dependence of lower mantle seismic velocities, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 259, 51-65.
- Mattern, E., et al. (2005), Lower mantle composition and temperature from mineral physics and thermodynamic modelling, *Geophysical Journal International*, 160, 973-990.
- Nakagawa, T., and P. J. Tackley (2004), Thermo-chemical structure in the mantle arising from a three-component convective system and implications for geochemistry, *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 146, 125-138.
- Oganov, A. R., et al. (2002), Ab initio theory of phase transitions and thermoelasticity of minerals, *EMU Notes in Mineralogy*, 4, 83-170.
- Ohta, K., et al. (2008), Phase transitions in pyrolite and MORB at lowermost mantle conditions: Implications for a MORB-rich pile above the core-mantle boundary, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 267, 107-117.
- Palme, H., and B. O'Neill (2003), Cosmochemical estimates of mantle composition, in *Treatise in Geology*, edited by H. Holland and K. K. Turekian, pp. 1-38, Elsevier, New York.
- Perrillat, J. P., et al. (2006), Phase transformations of subducted basaltic crust in the upmost lower mantle, *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 157, 139-149.
- Poirier, J. P. (2000), Introduction to the physics of the Earth's interior, edited, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.
- Rapp, R. P., et al. (2008), Subduction recycling of continental sediments and the origin of geochemically enriched reservoirs in the deep mantle, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 271, 14-23.
- Ravenna, M. (2009), A Reversible Jump Markov Chain Monte Carlo inversion method for layering and amplitude of seismic velocity variations: an application to 1-D structure of the lower mantle, *MPhil Thesis, Imperial College London*.
- Resovsky, J., and J. Trampert (2003), Using probabilistic seismic tomography to test mantle velocity-density relationships, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 215, 121-134.
- Saltzer, R. L., et al. (2001), Comparing P and S wave heterogeneity in the mantle, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 28, 1335-1338.
- Sambridge, M. et al. (2006) Trans-dimensional inverse problems, model comparison and the evidence, *Geophysical Journal International*, 167, 528-542.
- Sinha, G., and S. L. Butler (2007), On the origin and significance of subadiabatic temperature gradients in the mantle, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth*, 112.
- Speziale, S., et al. (2007), Effects of Fe spin transition on the elasticity of (Mg, Fe) O magnesiowustites and implications for the seismological properties of the Earth's lower mantle, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth*, 112.
- Stixrude, L., and C. Lithgow-Bertelloni (2005a), Mineralogy and elasticity of the oceanic upper mantle: Origin of the low-velocity zone, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth*, 110.
- Stixrude, L., and C. Lithgow-Bertelloni (2005b), Thermodynamics of mantle minerals - I. Physical properties, *Geophysical Journal International*, 162, 610-632.
- Stixrude, L., and C. Lithgow-Bertelloni (2007), Influence of phase transformations on lateral heterogeneity and dynamics in Earth's mantle, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 263, 45-55.
- Su, W. J., and A. M. Dziewonski (1997), Simultaneous inversion for 3-D variations in

- shear and bulk velocity in the mantle *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 100, 135-156.
- Sun, S. S. (1982), Chemical-Composition and Origin of the Earth's Primitive Mantle, *Geochimica Et Cosmochimica Acta*, 46, 179-192.
- Tan, E. and M. Gurnis (2007), Compressible thermochemical convection and application to lower mantle structures, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth*, 112.
- Trampert, J., et al. (2004), Probabilistic tomography maps chemical heterogeneities throughout the lower mantle, *Science*, 306, 853-856.
- Trampert, J., et al. (2001), Sensitivities of seismic velocities to temperature, pressure and composition in the lower mantle, *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 124, 255-267.
- Trieloff, M., et al. (2000), The nature of pristine noble gases in mantle plumes, *Science*, 288, 1036-1038.
- van der Hilst, R. D., and H. Karason (1999), Compositional heterogeneity in the bottom 1000 kilometers of Earth's mantle: Toward a hybrid convection model, *Science*, 283, 1885-1888.
- van der Hilst, R. D., et al. (1997), Evidence for deep mantle circulation from global tomography, *Nature*, 386, 578-584.
- Verhoeven, O., et al. (2009), Constraints on thermal state and composition of the Earth's lower mantle from electromagnetic impedances and seismic data, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth*, 114.
- Wentzcovitch, R. M., et al. (2004), Thermoelastic properties of MgSiO<sub>3</sub>-perovskite: Insights on the nature of the Earth's lower mantle, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 92.
- Williams, Q., and E. Knittle (2005), The uncertain major element bulk composition of the Earth's mantle, in *Earth's Deep Mantle: Structure, Composition and Evolution*, edited by R. Van der Hilst, et al., pp. 189-202, American Geophysical Union, Washington DC.
- Williamson, E. D., and L. H. Adams (1923), Density distribution in the Earth, *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences*, 13, 413-428.

## Figure Captions

Figure 1. Seismic data used in this study. Solid purple line (R08) is the output from our first inversion, in which the number of layers in the velocity model is allowed to vary. Dashed purple lines indicate 95% confidence bounds. Right-most panel shows the frequency with which layer interfaces occurred at each depth during this part of the inversion (which was run with 4 different starting models). There are no sharp peaks indicating no unambiguous discontinuities in the lower mantle, i.e. a very smooth structure. Hence the depths at which to place the layer interfaces is flexible – but have been chosen to correspond broadly with where the interface frequencies are highest (black dashed lines). Grey vertical bars show average velocities and gradients obtained with fixed layer interfaces during the second inversion, and subsequently used for comparison with thermochemical models.

Figure 2: Fit of adiabatic pyrolite to seismic data using different EoSs between 800 and 2500 km. Grey ellipse is 95% contour for 5000 models with randomly-varying elastic parameter uncertainties (uncertainties defined by Cammarano *et al.* [2003]), calculated with method *3E-Grun*. For comparison, the adiabatic pyrolite of Matas *et al.* [2007] is plotted. This was computed using a 3<sup>rd</sup> order Birch-Murnaghan pressure extrapolation and Mie-Gruneisen temperature extrapolation (i.e. *3E-Mie*). The differences between the velocities from our own seismic inversion (R08) and from AK135 and PREM indicate the amount of uncertainty on the seismic data. Note that P and S are not plotted to the same scale.

Figure 3. Illustration of the adiabatic, sub-adiabatic and super-adiabatic thermal structures tested in this study. The curves are labelled with the potential temperature. Pink bars show experimental constraints on lower mantle temperatures. At 660km, the temperature of the ringwoodite to perovskite transition is inferred from high pressure laboratory experiments [Akaogi, *et al.*, 1989; Katsura, *et al.*, 2004], whilst the *maximum* possible temperature at the CMB is estimated from the temperature of iron at its melting point at the inner-core outer-core boundary [Oganov, *et al.*, 2002].

Figure 4. Temperature derivatives of  $V_p$ ,  $V_s$ , bulk sound  $V_\phi$ , and density  $\rho$ , for adiabatic pyrolite. Horizontal axis shows percent change in velocity (or density) per 1000 degrees temperature change. This study: *3E-Mie-1,2*. Other studies: MB07 = [Matas and Bukowinski, 2007]; T01 = [Trampert, *et al.*, 2001]; G04 = [Goes, *et al.*, 2004]. *3E-Mie-1* and *-2* include both elastic uncertainties and anelastic uncertainties and encompass the other three published models. There is reasonably good agreement between the different studies.

Figure 5: Average lower mantle velocities and velocity gradients for different thermal structures. Adiabats shown in upper 4 panels, non-adiabats in lower 4 panels. Sub-1, Super-1,2,3, refer to the temperature profiles illustrated in Figure 3. Solid symbols are output using method *3E-Mie-1*; open symbols represent output from method *3E-Mie-2*. Note that superadiabatic profiles improve the fit to average velocity gradients between 1660–2000 km, and that the average velocities of non-adiabatic structures lie along the same trend line as the adiabatic structures.

Figure 6. Velocity and density trends for changes in bulk composition, parameterised in terms of the 5 oxides Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, CaO, FeO, MgO and SiO<sub>2</sub>. Refer to text for further details. Solid arrows are results using *3E-Mie-1* EoS; dashed arrows are from *3E-Mie-2*. Pyrolite (green diamonds) and thermal trend (grey band, from Figure 5) are shown for comparison. Alternative compositions all computed using a  $T_p=1300\text{C}$  adiabat for the thermal structure.

**Figure 7: Average velocities, velocity gradients and densities for different bulk compositions (defined in Table 1) in which the lower mantle may be enriched. Solid symbols and lines were calculated using method *3E-Mie-1*; open symbols and dashed lines were calculated using method *3E-Mie-2*. Red data points are seismic constraints. Alternative compositions all computed using a  $T_p=1300^\circ\text{C}$  adiabat for the thermal structure. Grey bars show change in properties with temperature, from Figure 5.**

**Figure 8: Velocity-depth profiles for alternative thermal (a) and chemical (b) structures tested in this study. Note that superadiabatic structures reduce gradients, providing a means of improving fit to the seismic data. Compositionally, note the fit of the solar (i.e. iron-enriched) composition in the lowermost mantle.**

## Tables

	SiO <sub>2</sub>	MgO	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	FeO	CaO	Mg/Si
pyrolite <sup>1</sup>	38.61	49.13	2.77	6.24	3.25	1.272468
harzburgite <sup>2</sup>	36.22	57.42	0.48	5.44	0.44	1.585312
MORB <sup>3</sup>	53.82	13.64	10.13	8.80	13.60	0.253437
chondrite <sup>4</sup>	43.52	46.74	1.84	5.25	2.66	1.074112
solar <sup>5</sup>	40.03	43.37	1.68	11.68	3.24	1.083306

**Table 1: End-member compositions tested in this study, expressed as molar percentages.** Taken from <sup>1</sup>[Sun, 1982]; <sup>2</sup>[Irifune and Ringwood, 1987]; <sup>3</sup>[Perrillat, et al., 2006]; <sup>4</sup>[Hart and Zindler, 1986]; <sup>5</sup>[Anderson, 1989].

















